

42/2

A N

ARGUMENT

Proving, that the

152

Method taken for Obstructing

Dr. RUNDLE's Advancement

TO THE

See of G-----r

Is dangerous to his Majesty's Prerogative,
our most Excellent Constitution, the Liberty
of Lay-Subjects, and the Christian Religion.

A L S O A

R E P L Y

T O

The C A S E of Dr. Rundle's Promotion
to the See of G-----r, &c. impartially consider'd;
and to the Miscellany of Dec. 7. last.

L O N D O N,

Printed, and sold by J. WILFORD, behind
the Chapter-House in St. Paul's Church-yard,
and at the Pamphlet-Shops of London and
Westminster. 1735. Price 6 d.

AN ARGUMENT

Proving, that the
 Method taken for Opposing
 Dr. RUNDLE's Advancements

TO THE
 See of

is dangerous to his Majesty's Privileges,
 our most Excellent Constitution, the Liberty
 of Lay-Subjects, and the Christian Religion

ALSO A
 R E P L Y

The CASE of Dr. Rundle's Promotion
 to the See of G., and his Majesty's Privileges
 and to the Liberty of Lay-Subjects



L O N D O N

Printed and sold by J. W. Atterbury, behind
 the Church in St. Paul's Church-yard
 and at the Pamphlet-Sellers of London and
 Westminster. 1733. Price 6d.



A N

ARGUMENT,

P R O V I N G,

That the Method taken for obstructing Dr. *Rundle's* Advancement to the See of G——r, is Dangerous to His Majesty's Prerogative, our most Excellent Constitution, the Liberty of Lay-Subjects, and the Christian Religion.

THE Opposition a Reverend Divine meets with, in the Preferment intended him by the Interest and Recommendation of the highest Civil Minister in the Kingdoms of *Great-Britain*, has so much excited the Attention and Curiosity of the Friends, as well as Enemies, to our happy Establishment, that both seem to wait with Impatience, the Event of an Incident, so singular and uncommon. Had it been a Dispute of a personal Nature, or a Matter of Right and Power only, between a L——d C——r, and a Right Reverend Prelate, and not in its Consequences extended much farther, the Reader's Trouble and my own would have been prevented.

That a Power only delegated and temporary to a certain Bishop, has been exerted by him, in many Instances, beyond the *Wisdom*

B

and

and *Prudence*, of any *wise* and *good* Man, is too notorious to be denied, more particularly in the Case of Dr. *Rundle*; and who, by *undue Influences*, has fomented an unprecedented Restraint on the Crown, from supplying the vacant See of *G—r*, by Methods the least eligible, and most unbecoming a Pious and Christian Bishop, a good and faithful Subject; expressive also of Principles the most malignant and dangerous, to the Prerogative of the Crown, and the Liberty of the Subject.

An Attempt then so bold and daring, makes it a concern of the utmost Moment and Importance, to every honest *Briton*, and true Protestant; to every Man of Merit and Goodness; to all who are sincerely attached, to the Welfare and Prosperity of our most Gracious Sovereign, and the Succession of the *British* Crown, in his Royal Family; and therefore, as a faithful Subject to the best of Kings, as a fellow Subject to an obedient People, as a Christian, a Lover of Truth, Liberty, and Humanity, I thought it a Duty incumbent on me, to Display a little of this *wise* Man's Conduct to the World, that all might have some, tho' but an imperfect Idea, of his political Principles, and artful Practices.

— And if it shall appear, that what this Right Reverend Prelate has openly acted, given into, or avowed, does manifestly tend to lessen and diminish his Majesty's just and legal Prerogative; is also Injurious to the *English* Constitution, and the Subject's Liberty, and equally inconsistent with the Character and Duty, essential to a Christian and Protestant Bishop; then it is to be hoped, that this Nation will
show

show themselves true *Englishmen*, in marking the Man, who it seems hath so often marked others; and not be induced, by his artful Suggestions, to believe whatever himself, or his Missionaries may invent and propagate, whereby to deceive the Unwary, to please the Disaffected, and irritate the ignorant Populace, to a mutinous Inclination; should not *this* or *other* Preferments take Place, according to the *Marks* and *Characteristics* which he has assumed to make and give of Men; the Dispute not being so much between a *Ld. C—r* and a *B—p*, as the Prerogative of the Crown, the Rights of Lay-Subjects, the Reputation and Character of Men.

That the See of *G—r* has been long vacant, and much beyond the usual time; that *Dr. R—e* was recommended by the *Ld. High C—r* to that See, and would have been consecrated *Bp.* thereof, had not a certain *P—e* obstructed and prevented it; are, I apprehend, Facts so true, as not to be disputed. Had his *Lord—p* any legal Objections, supported by proper Evidence, against the Reverend Person's Promotion to a Bishoprick; it would have been but just and reasonable in itself, decent, and respectful to his Sovereign, and very pleasing and satisfactory to the People, to have made the same publick to the World; this his *Lord—p* has not done, to the Surprise and Admiration of all, and yet exerts his Power to stop the *Dr.'s* Promotion.

And is not an Attempt to obstruct, oppose, and hinder his Majesty's Presentation to a Bishoprick, without legal and just Reasons offered, assuming a Supremacy inconsistent with

the Laws of *England*, and a Protestant Church, and a manifest Encroachment on the Prerogative of the Crown? If such is not an evident Instance thereof, I know not what can be? And if a B—p of the Church of *England*, will act so contrary to his Oath, as a Subject, and to his Obligations of Submission to his Majesty, the Supreme Head of the Church, as a Spiritual Officer therein, what a fatal Tendency must this have, to disparage and debase his Majesty's Prerogative in the Minds of the People, and to alienate their Affection and faithful Allegiance from his Royal Person? And for a B—p to use Measures that tend either to prevent or distress his Sovereign, in disposing of Ecclesiastical Preferments, is a plain Indication, that the Supremacy of the Church is his only Aim, the *Zenith* of his political Views; and that such are in Fact his real Principles, the Preface to his *Codex*, will ever be a lasting Evidence, to prove the Truth thereof.

Will then *English* Protestants be idle Spectators at this dangerous advance on Prerogative; this *Romish* assuming Power in Matters Ecclesiastical? An Attempt that his *Metropolitan*, whose more immediate Right it is to judge of the Character and Qualifications of Bishops, would be ashamed to make, much less to insist on, as knowing it unbecoming his Duty and Allegiance, tho' in Dignity superior. And shall his Suffragan B—p meet with Encouragement and Countenance, in aspiring to a Prelatical Power over the Crown, that his *Metropolitan* would not pretend to? I persuade my self the old *Protestant* Principle,

ple, of opposing the Excess of Ecclesiastical Power, is not quite exterminated this *Protestant* Kingdom; but that many remain, who will exert themselves in Favour of his Majesty's legal, just, and undoubted Prerogative; and Discountenance, with the utmost Detestation and Abhorrence, every Attempt that any ambitious Ecclesiastic shall make, to usurp over it: And to do so, will be worthy *Protestants*, *Britons*, all who adhere to Monarchy, Liberty, and the Rights of Mankind.

And if this *wise* Prelate hath thus actually resisted his Sovereign's just Prerogative, in preferring *one* or *more* to the Mitre, who were agreeable to his Royal Will; and whose *Will* hath been ever directed with the greatest Wisdom and Prudence (and there is no shadow of Reason to surmise the contrary at any time hereafter) is not this a most glaring Instance, of an *intended* Design, to bring back the *Power* of the *Church* into the *Hands* of *Ecclesiastics*? And what then can be a more daring Attack on our Constitution, as well as the King's Prerogative? His L—p must also remember the Oath he has so often taken, wherein the Supremacy of the Church is disclaimed; and ought to be sensible, what an evil Influence, any Action contrary thereto, will naturally have on the Minds of every one to the Prejudice of Religion.

As to what concerns the Subjects Liberty, if it should be true, that a B—p hath either affirmed, declared, or avowed, the Principle asserted by many, who are known Emissaries to his L—p, that it is “ improper and unfit for a Layman to recommend to a
“ Bishoprick,”

“ Bishoprick, ” or to “ intermeddle in such “ Spiritual Affairs ; ” is not such a Procedure injurious to his Majesty’s Lay-Subjects, to the temporal Peers, as well as the great Officers of the Crown, who ever since the Reformation have enjoyed that Right, and recommended Men, who adorned their Holy Profession, and were the greatest Ornaments to the Church of *England*, it was ever blessed with ? Innumerable are the many, that have been recommended by Temporal Lords, and Ministers of State. Was not the present Primate of *England* preferred to his first See by the Interest of a Temporal Lord lately deceased ; also the Bp. of *N—b*, and the Bp. elect of *C—e*, besides many others. And must the ancient, reasonable, Right and Privileges of temporal Peers, and great Officers of State be questioned, and attempted to be taken from them ?

Shall the first, who is to feel the Weight, and direful Effects, of this aspiring Ecclesiastic’s great Power, and spiritual Indignation, be no other than that Noble and Right Honourable Person, whom His Majesty exalted to the highest Civil Office in the two Kingdoms, from a just Sense of his perfect Knowledge of the Laws, and Practice of that Court wherein he presides ; of his distinguished Judgment, great Abilities, and superior Merit ; of his sincere Affection, true Zeal, and hearty Attachment to his Royal Person and Family : At whose Advancement to that high and eminent Station, the whole Nation gave a concurrent Approbation, and unanimously applauded His Majesty’s Wisdom, in the

the Election of so able a Minister, to that supreme, weighty, and important Office; and who, since his Promotion to that Honour and Dignity, has executed the same, with the utmost Fidelity to his Most Gracious Sovereign, the exactest Equity, the strictest Integrity, and most condescending Affability to the Subject; equal, if not exceeding, the Experience of any former time, and shall the crafty Designs of a Political Prelate succeed, to defeat this great Personage, of such singular Worth and Estimation, of a Right and Privilege, which others of inferior Rank and Dignity have often exercised, and had allowed them? It is to be hoped not; all, but those who worship *Baal*, most heartily wish the contrary.

And the Case before us, tho' it needed not, has this Circumstance of farther Aggravation, that the Divine, recommended by the *Ld. High C——r*, to the See of *G——r*, was many Years Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship's own Father; a most Excellent, Pious, and Christian Prelate, who frequently stood in the Gap to oppose Attempts leading to Ecclesiastical Tyranny, and whose memorable Speech on the Tryal of an ignorant, but imperious haughty Clergyman, will ever remain an eternal Monument of his love to Liberty, and detestation of usurped Spiritual Powers; of his inviolable Attachment, and strict Adherence to those rational Principles which first effected the glorious Revolution; afterwards produced the Succession of the Crown in the *Protestant* House of *Hanover*, and were at last instrumental to its taking Place. Principles! that
can

can only perpetuate, and make lasting to us, the Enjoyment of that Heavenly Blessing.

That then so Christian and Pious a Prelate, should be supposed to retain in his Family an Arian, or Infidel, or Heretic, or Immoral Man ; what a Reflection is this on his pious Memory, as well as the Noble and Right Honourable Person his Son, who recommends him ?

As to the Reverend Divine, I never saw him to my knowledge, nor have I the Honour to be particularly known to the Great Man his Friend ; and the only Motives to my writing this, were, Love to Truth and Charity, Liberty and Humanity. For as none is exempt from all Defects, or totally free of common Infirmities, so if any small Fault, unguarded Expression, or imprudent Action, must be magnified, exaggerated, and animadverted on, to the utmost extent that Malice and Envy will suggest ; then is no Man living secure, from being render'd Odious and Infamous.

If the Objections against Dr. *Rundle's* Pre-ferment, do not imply “ want of Learning,
 “ want of good Temper, defect in Morals, or
 “ in any one thing required to be a B—p ;—
 “ and that he is a Man of Ingenuity, easy in
 “ Conversation, a Man of no Guile, a lover
 “ of Truth, a Friend to even all those that
 “ are not of the same Sentiments with himself ;
 “ a Man of Hospitality, generous, of good
 “ natural Parts, and of good acquired ones.—
 “ That he is an innocent, inoffensive, good-
 “ natur'd Man, against whom no Vices, no
 “ Immoralities, no Infidelity, can be justly ob-
 “ jected.—

“ jected.—That he is a Conformist to the
 “ Religion established ; has subscribed the Ar-
 “ ticles of our Church, given his Assent and
 “ Consent to the Book of Common-Prayer,
 “ and ready to do all this again,” as is af-
 firmed by a late Author, in a *Letter to a*
Member of Parliament, wherein the Reasons a-
gainst the Dr.’s Promotion to the See of G—r
are considered. I say, if this is the Dr.’s just
 and true Character, it must shock every one,
 to think any B—p should have been an Ene-
 my to this Man’s Promotion : Or if the P—e,
 who only or chiefly opposes him, had Rea-
 sons sufficient to urge against his being pro-
 moted, why has he not produced them to the
 World, with his Name thereto, as a Christian
 B — p, by virtue of his Episcopal Office,
 ought to have done ? Or commenced a legal
 Prosecution against him, if his Crimes were
 such as deserved so much Notice as to incapa-
 citate him for a B — p ? And if any material
 Objections lay against him, which he could be
 legally convicted of, every good Man, as
 well as this Prelate, would equally show a
 Dislike to the Dr.’s farther Advancement.

Thus to have acted would have been a just,
 reasonable, and christian Proceeding ; and which
 the impartial Part of Mankind are inclin’d to
 believe, that his L——p would have so *wisely*
 done, had it been in his Power. They also
 think, his L — p would himself have publick-
 ly disowned, that the remarkable Passage extract-
 ed from Bp. *Burnet’s History*, was sent to the
 Press by his Order, Privity, or Knowledge,
 could he have denied it consistent with Truth.

These things the discerning, and most judi-

cious Part of Mankind have long expected from his L—p, and till it is complied with, they must and will think, the ejected Arrow has recoiled, and wounded the *Marksman*, instead of the innocent Person he had aimed at, and marked for Destruction. And should his L—p still decline to afford the Public Satisfaction, as to the Part he has acted in this Affair, and sever Truth from any Aspersions, that has been unjustly cast, all will believe he is more guilty of greater Crimes than the accused Divine.

And if the Reverend Dr. is guilty of no Crime, but is a Person of religious Principles, of good Morals, Probity, and Integrity, has subscribed the Articles of Religion, and is every way qualified for the Office and Function of a Bp. how inexcusable must it be in any, either Personally, or by his Agents, to Asperse, Defame, and Slander an innocent Person, in the manner Dr. *Rundle* has most woefully experienced.

The Learned Dr. *Barrow* in his 4th and 5th Discourses on Evil Speaking, judiciously observes, “ That we should never speak Ill
 “ of any Man, without apparent just Cause.
 “ That it must be just, clear and certain, notorious and palpable; for to speak Ill upon
 “ slender Conjectures, or doubtful Suspicions,
 “ is full of Iniquity. — To impose odious
 “ Names and Characters on any Person,
 “ which he deserveth not, or without ground
 “ of Truth, is to play the Devil; and Hell
 “ itself scarce will own a fouler Practice.”
That as “ Words are ambiguous, and capable of different Senses, — one, that Candor
 “ and

“ and Charity will ; another, that Disingenui-
 “ ty and Spite may lay hold on : and in such
 “ Case, to misapprehend is a calumnious Pro-
 “ cedure, arguing malignant disposition and
 “ mischievous Design. Thus, when two Men
 “ did witness, that our Lord affirmed, he
 “ *could demolish the Temple, and rear it again*
 “ *in three days*, Matt. xxvi. 60. Altho’ he
 “ did indeed speak *Words* to that *Purpose*,
 “ meaning them in a figurative Sense,—yet
 “ they who crudely alledged them against him
 “ are called false Witnesses. Thus also when
 “ some certified of St. Stephen, as having said,
 “ that, *Jesus of Nazareth should destroy that*
 “ *place, and change the customs that Moses de-*
 “ *livered*, Acts vi. 13, 14. altho’ probably he
 “ did speak Words near to that Purpose, yet
 “ are those Men called *false Witnesses*—
 “ which Instances plainly do shew, if we
 “ would avoid the guilt of Slander, how care-
 “ ful we should be, to interpret fairly and
 “ and favourably, the Words and the Acti-
 “ ons of our Neighbour.

“ Another sort of Slander is, partial and
 “ lame Representation of Mens Discourse ;
 “ suppressing some part of the Truth in them,
 “ or concealing some Circumstances against
 “ them, which might serve to explain or
 “ extenuate them.—Thus, suppose a Man
 “ speaketh a thing upon *Supposition*, or with
 “ *Exception*, or in way of *Objection*, or
 “ *meerly* for *Disputation* sake, in order to the
 “ *discussing* and *clearing* of *Truth* ; he that
 “ *should Report him asserting it absolutely, un-*
 “ *limitedly, positively, and peremptorily, as his*

“ own settled Judgment, would notoriously calumniate.

“ Another Practice, worthily bearing the
 “ guilt of Slander, is being aiding, and necessary thereto, by anywise furthering, cherishing, abetting it. — There are not only
 “ slanderous Throats, but slanderous Ears;—
 “ were it not for such free Entertainers, such
 “ Nourishers, such Encouragers of them, Slanders, for want of Nourishment, soon would
 “ starve. It is such Friends and Patrons of them,
 “ who are the Causes that they are so rife; they
 “ are those who set ill-natur'd, base, and designing People, upon devising, searching after,
 “ and picking up malicious and idle Stories;
 “ were it not for such Customers, the Trade
 “ of calumniating would fall.

“ *Posidonius* relateth of *St. Austin*, that he
 “ had written on his Table these two Verses :

*Quisquis amat dictis absentum rodere vitam,
 Hanc mensam indignam noverit esse sibi.*

“ And if any there did use Detraction, he was
 “ offended, and minded them of those Verses,
 “ threatening also to leave the Table, and withdraw to his Chamber. *Posid. cap. 22.*”

I hope the Reader, considering the Circumstances of the present Case, and that the learned Author had expressed himself so very applicable thereto, will not be offended at the length of the Quotation; nor is it produced with any Design to give Information to his L—p, how wicked, unchristian, and base, Slander and Calumny are in their own Nature; how contrary to the Gospel of Christ;
 and

and how much detested by all good Men ; since his L—p can himself, give as ample Instructions to others on the same Subject, and with as much, or greater strength of Reason and Argument, whenever he pleases. But my Design thereby chiefly is, to remind others of their Duty in a Point so necessary and essential to a good Christian. That every Man may be sensible, as the same learned Divine further observes, “ how easily it may be his own Case, “ how liable he is to be abused, in a way against “ which there is no Guard or Defence.”

That Dr. R—e does labour under an ill Fame, and has been greatly traduced and abused, not by Facts proved, or supported Allegations ; but on general Surmises, and artful Insinuations, I think, is apparent and well known ; and I hope the dangerous nature of Slander and Calumny, has been sufficiently shown from Dr. Barrow. In Case therefore the B — p should have encouraged or abetted any to asperse Dr. R—e, in the Manner he has been ; either by dictating, correcting, or approving, of any Writings tending that way ; or has not exercised his Episcopal Power in preventing others from pursuing such unchristian Practices, if known to him ; in either case, Mankind will think, and with good Reason, That such Conduct is contrary to the Gospel of Christ, and inconsistent with the Character and Office of a Christian B — p.

That it has been affirmed, and is generally believed, that the B — p has oppos'd the Dr.'s Promotion, and yet has not given any Reasons himself for such Opposition, tho' the Dr. suffers in the Esteem of many, is notorious

ous to all. That a Man's good Name is a Prize of inestimable Value, oftentimes dearer than Life itself, is what every Individual thinks when it is his own Case ; and, as Dr. *Barrow* truly observes, " That to take it away, is an " Injustice not to be corrected or cured. " Thefts may be restored, Wounds may be " cured ; but there is no Restitution or Cure " of a lost good Name : It is therefore an " irreparable Injury."

Should then his L—p have had any Hand himself, or abetted and encouraged others, thus to abuse and defame a Man in Generals, without the Proof of any one certain Fact alledged. And which has been not only detrimental to Dr. *Rundle* in particular, but the noble Ld. his Friend, may in some degree possibly suffer, for recommending the Man whom the B—p has *marked improper*. Will not such a Behaviour in his L—p tend to give the Enemies of our Religion an Advantage ? Will not the Deists and Infidels triumph to hear, should it be true, that the L—d B—p, who writ several Tracts against them, has since more deviated from the Precepts of that Gospel he judiciously defended, by an unexampled breach of Charity, than any thing to be found in their Lives and Actions ?

Should his L—p have encouraged, or connived at any, to defame a Man innocent and virtuous, worthy and deserving the Episcopal Dignity, in order to prevent his Advancement thereto ; Is not such a Behaviour ill in itself, and also dangerous in its Consequences ? since the best of Men may not be able to escape Slander and Calumny,
when

when any Man may think it subservient to his political Views. The Reverend Dr.'s noble Friend, knows much better than me, how to advise him to a legal Remedy, as well as to a proper Method, whereby to clear him of his imputed Crimes, and that by the Testimony of more than *six* Bishops.

If then the Conduct of this *wise* Prelate, by opposing the Promotion of Dr. *Rundle* in the Manner it's said he has done, has a natural Tendency to lessen and diminish the King's Prerogative, is also injurious to our Constitution, and the Liberty of the Subjects, and equally inconsistent with the Character and Duty of a Christian and B—p. I need not say in what light the World must behold the Man. And was Dr. *R—e* guilty of only one such Crime, and in its Nature but one half so Heinous; so far from his having my Vote, to be B — p of G—r, that I would, was it in my Power, have him punished according to his Deserts. For it is only the religious, good, and virtuous Man, that, with my good Will, should ever be raised to that Honour and Dignity. And if what I have represented is true, as I am persuaded it is, and all must know it to be so, who are the least Conversant in publick Transactions; then I hope none will dislike the Manner of my Conclusion; which, as a well Wisher to my King and Country, the Protestant Religion, our Laws and Liberties, I knew not how to be dispensed from.

My Thoughts then are, that if ever any B—p should have so much Weight, Power, and Influence, as to obstruct His Majesty's Measures,

Measures, in supplying, and filling up vacant Sees, and to bring all Preferments in the Church in his own Power and Disposal ; it will afford a most melancholy Prospect to all who are hearty Friends to the present Establishment ; it will equally elate and give Advantage to its Enemies ; and may prove of more fatal Consequence, than I presume to intimate. And should that ever be the Case, who will then see one in so sacred a Station, without melancholy Reflections, inward Grief, expressive of Indignation, as well as Fear and Trembling. For Power Supreme in Ecclesiastical Affairs, may not stop such a Man's impetuous Ambition ; but he may proceed farther, and exert his Influence to the Destruction of such Civil Officers as dare to be true *Englishmen*, and oppose his aspiring Views ; under a Pretence such Removals will be for the Interest of his Prince, and the Church's Safety and Preservation. And, from a Lord High Chancellor, to a Secretary of State, may it be expected none will escape the Fury of his Resentment ?

But as we have a Prince on the Throne of great Penetration and clear Discernment, who has a just Concern for his own legal Prerogatives, and equally delights in his Subjects Happiness ; let us not fear, but so Excellent a Prince, will ever Discountenance and bring to Shame, any impetuous Prelate, that shall hereafter, with matchless Arrogance, attempt to share a Power Regal ; and as God's Vicegerent on Earth, will say to any such Man, as *He* himself has done, to the proud and boisterous

rous Waves of the Sea, *Hitherto you shall go, and no farther.*

Let then none of the Clergy or Laity question, but that such of them as will engage in the Maintenance of the just and undoubted Prerogatives of the Crown, the true Protestant Religion, the Rights and Liberties of the Subject (the old Revolution-Principles) will ever find Countenance and Acceptance from that Prince, who enjoys, and did inherit the Crown of *Great Britain*, from those Principles only.

For should ever a Power Ecclesiastical, beyond the Limits and Boundaries of the present Laws, be connived at in any Prelate, that now is, or hereafter may be ; then farewell the Prerogative of the Crown, the Protestant Religion, and the Liberties of *Englishmen*.

History affords such dreadful Instances of foreign and domestic Ecclesiastic Tyranny, that all need tremble under any Apprehensions of its Approach. And should the Man, who asserts, that the Legislature, "by putting the Help which it designs for the Church into the hands of the Laity, does the Church a manifest Disservice : That wherever it puts the Work of *even* the Suppression of Vice into *Temporal Hands*, it puts it into a Channel, where it is not so likely to succeed, as into *Spiritual Hands*." Who conceives that — Temporal Penalties may be useful in Matters of Religion, and that "the only way to make them truly beneficial to Religion, is, to provide them as a further

D

"Terror

“ *Terror and Punishment*, to be called in as oft as the *Censures* of the *Church* are disobey’d.” And who is against “ the Courts of King’s Bench and Common Pleas from having power to grant Prohibitions to the Spiritual Court ” I say, should this *bumble Protestant B*—p ever have power to put in execution his declared Purposes, *the Lord have Mercy upon us*

But if he is a *wise Man*, for his own Safety, and the Kingdom’s Peace, and future Felicity, it might be more adviseable for him, to desist from all future aspiring Views ; and to act consistent with his Oath, his public Character, and the Precepts of that Gospel, whose Authority he has so well defended.

It might not be amiss, for his L--d-f--p to call to remembrance, that a Lord Chancellor was impeached for high Crimes and Misdemeanors, on an Occasion well known ; and that a late Bishop of *Rocheſter*, who, from a certain Persuasion his Ambition could not be gratified, in being promoted to the See of *Canterbury* ; forgot the Oath he had taken, his Episcopal Character, the Peace and Happiness of his Fellow-Subjects, and stuck at nothing, no, not the vilest and most detestable Methods, to accomplish his Designs, of raising himself to that high Dignity ; and that God debased the Man of Pride, by a Bill of Pains and Penalties, which prevented him from doing that mischief, his Influence, Reputation, and Power, might have otherwise effected.

And

And should ever another Object, guilty of the like Crimes, or those of a more aggravated, and accumulated nature, be found, such may expect a suitable Punishment, and not to escape with Impunity : For its most certain, that an exorbitant, usurped Ecclesiastical Power, this King and Nation will never submit to. And the B——p, who will sacrifice a Clergyman to his ambitious Views, affords a melancholy Prospect, of what Laymen are to expect, unless subservient to all his Measures, should he ever have Power equal to his Will.

It has been said, an humble and self-denying P——e has been offered—— D—— m, and W—— n, and at different times refused each. How true the Fact may be, I know not ; but should it be done with a sole View to reach the Top of all, his L——p, will not be the first, that has caught at a Shadow, and missed the Substance. And if it may happen to be verified in his Case, then will the Many rejoice, and be exceeding glad ; the Inhabitants of this Land will clap their hands, and shout for joy.

Since the Revolution, none but Persons of the greatest Temper, Humility, and Moderation, as well as Religion, Learning and Knowledge, have been exalted to that high and Eminent Station ; and it ought not to be insinuated, that the Maxims of those illustrious Princes, should by their Royal Successors be imitated in every other Instance, than in what concerns this great Preferment, of so much moment, both to Church and State.

Let me remind all of the necessary Advice and Cautions given by the present good and pious Bishop of London † “ The Laws of
 “ God and Man have made the Prince, the
 “ Fountain of Power and Authority ; and in
 “ what Channells it shall flow, or by whose
 “ Countel and Assistance it shall be administred,
 “ is left to Royal Wisdom and Discretion,
 “ within the Compass of the Laws. Nor is it
 “ only the Duty of every Subject, to be ready
 “ with his Advice and Assistance, when he is
 “ *called upon* to give it ; but it is his Duty also,
 “ not to murmur, repine, or be uneasy to Go-
 “ vernment, if his Advice happen not to be
 “ askt, or not be taken ; nay, to rejoyce heartily
 “ in the Welfare and Prosperity, of the Pub-
 “ lick, to what Hands and Heads soever it is
 “ owing. Which Branch of the Duty of a
 “ Christian Subject, seems now a Days, to be
 “ forgotten by too many ; who valuing their
 “ own Wisdom above that of their Prince,
 “ reckon it a just Occasion of Disgust and Re-
 “ sentment, if he employ not the very Persons ;
 “ they would name, or think that the Publick
 “ can prosper in any other way, than that
 “ they would direct. — And therefore, when
 “ we observe the same Person extolling or
 “ debasing his Sovereign, according to the Smiles
 “ or Frowns of the Court ; one while support-

† Four Sermons, 2d. Edit. p. 11.

ing Prerogative, and then again sinking it;
 at one time * Studying to make the
 Administration easy, at another time ob-
 structing and perplexing it; we may be sure,
 such a man has not the true Spirit of the
 Church of England, which acts upon a higher
 and more noble Principle, than Humour or
 Interest, and needs not to be bribed or courted
 into Loyalty'. — † 'That 'tis far from
 the Temper of the English, and the Nature
 of our Constitution, to make Men suffer upon
 bare Presumption: But at the same time, the
 regard we owe to our selves, and our Consti-
 tution, calls upon us, to be very watchful,
 when we are sure there is an Enemy in our
 own Bowels. When we find such a Spirit
 moving among us, it behoves us to observe
 narrowly which way it moves, and to what
 degrees; that it may be kept under such
 Restraints, as the safety of Church and State
 shall require". And if ever so wise a Man's
 Advice was necessary to be taken, it's hoped it
 will not be neglected, in a point so essentially
 necessary; as to have a watchful Eye over
 such an Enemy in our own Bowels. As that
 Man must certainly be, who attempts an abso-
 lute Power, in Matters Ecclesiastical.

There is no Man living, more honors the
 sacred Orders of the Ministry, retained in the
 Church of England, nor is more tenacious of
 their just Rights, and Lawful Powers, than my

* Ibid. p. 17. † Ibid. p. 41.

self. But, when we find a Spirit moving, that may endanger the King's Prerogative, and the Liberty of Lay-subjects, and the private Characters of Men, it behoves all to observe narrowly which way it moves; and to keep it under such restraints, as may be safe to Church and State.

I proceed now to consider, what is advanced by a certain Country - Clergyman, against Dr. Rundle's Preferment, in a Pamphlet, entitl'd, *The Case of Dr. Rundle's Promotion to the See of Gloucester, &c. impartially consider'd.* And whoever peruses it with Care and Attention, cannot avoid observing, with what attempted Art and Sophistry, but real Weakness and Inconsistency, the Author has executed that Performance; a few Instances whereof it may be necessary to give.

In Page 9. in answer to the Letter he remark'd on, says he, "I think, the main stress of the Cause lies", in, "that the Lord C——r can never give up Dr. R——; that it is now his own Cause, much more than the Dr's." Which the Author of that Letter had urged. But when it is "to serve another purpose, then it is represented thus: "To speak the truth; this Affair has made so great a noise, that it is no longer the Cause of the L---d C——, or of the Bishop of London, or of Dr. Rundle; but it is the Cause of the Public; it is the Cause of Christianity," p. 16. And, says he in the same Page, "Let the Reasonableness of this Opposition be try'd upon this single Point, which

‘ which alone can, or ought to determine it,
 ‘ — whether Christianity is likely to suffer
 ‘ more by Dr. *Rundle*’s being promoted to a
 ‘ Bishoprick, than from his being denied that
 ‘ high Station ?” And yet after all this, when
 he comes to p. 17. then the Promotion of Dr.
Rundle to the See of *Glocester* is to be consider’d
 “ in the light of giving Offence to Num-
 ‘ bers of pious Christians ; which is the only
 ‘ light in which it ought to be consider’d.”

“ Strange ! that this Writer should so far
 “ forget himself,” as to be guilty of such no-
 torious Contradictions, within the compass of
 eight Pages, and to make three different Consi-
 derations of one single Point. What concerns
 the Lord C—r, wherein this Author says,
the main stress of the Cause lies, I dare not
 presume to make any Observations on that
 Head, not having any Authority for so doing.
 But, as to the Author’s Assertion, “ that the
 ‘ Reasonableness of the Opposition to Dr.
 ‘ *Rundle*’s Preferment, ought to be try’d on
 ‘ the *single Point* of Christianity’s being likely
 ‘ to suffer by his Promotion ;” and one other,
viz. “ the only Light in which it ought to
 ‘ be consider’d, as it may give offence to well-
 ‘ meaning pious People.” These two, “ the
 ‘ one single Point which ought to determine
 ‘ it ;” or “ the only Light in which it ought
 ‘ to be considered,” I will beg leave to exa-
 mine ; and doubt not to prove, that each
 Suggestion is inconclusive, and not one, or
 both, a good or true Argument against the
 Doctor’s being promoted to a Bishoprick ; sup-
 posing his Character such as the Author of
 the Case affirms.

But

But I must, in justice to my self, first point out a little more of this Author's Art and Sophistry.

When he would vindicate a Reverend Prelate from an Aspersion he supposes to be cast on him; then he seems perfectly ignorant of the Crimes the Dr. is accused of. Says he, "Whatever be the reason, that the great Churchman (as this Writer affects to call a Reverend Prelate) 'opposes Dr. Rundle's 'being promoted to a Bishoprick, it is plain, '---- that the *reason cannot be*," &c. p. 9. But to serve another occasion, he declares himself to be fully apprized of those things laid to his charge, viz. "of having spoken things 'unbecoming a Preacher of the Gospel, and 'which may seem to argue an Irreverence 'for the holy Scriptures." His Words are, — "But Christianity may suffer by the Doctor's being promoted to that high Station, 'as it may give *offence* to Numbers of good 'Christians, particularly those under his care, 'who may be possessed, that he is guilty of 'those things laid to his charge; and consequently, this must render him incapable of 'doing the same good in his Diocess, 'as another Person, against whom no such 'Charge can be brought, of *having spoken 'things unbecoming a Preacher of the Gospel,* 'and which may seem to argue an Irreverence 'for the holy Scriptures." p. 17.

Again, When he would not write with Prejudice against Dr. Rundle, but that Candor, Integrity, and a real Concern for the Dr.'s Misfortune, should be supposed to have no small

small Influence on his Pen ; then, he would
 have it believed, that " it is far from him, to
 ' to justify those who were the Informers a-
 ' gainst the Dr." that he thinks, " nothing can
 ' justify the part they have acted ; not only
 ' as it is betraying of private Conversation, the
 ' relating an unguarded Expression, the being
 ' the occasion of such an unhappy Contenti-
 ' on as this, and the preventing a very *wor-*
 ' *thy Man* from being made a Bishop ; who,
 ' whatever unguarded Expression, might fall
 ' from him in his younger Days, and in a free
 ' Conversation, might probably be very far from
 ' being designed to express any Irreverence
 ' for the Scriptures ; and for which *he* believes
 ' all who know him, are satisfied he has the
 ' greatest Esteem and Reverence." p. 14.
 " That he agrees, the whole of what has been
 ' said by the Author of the Letter, of the
 ' Unrighteousness of the Accusation brought
 ' against the Dr. is true ; *and that* it certainly
 ' is a great Cruelty to Dr. Rundle ; and what
 ' every other Man would think so, were it his
 ' own Case." p. 17.

" On the other hand," if to justify a Reve-
 rend Prelate in his opposition to Dr. Rundle ;
 then this candid and good-natur'd Clergyman
 can lessen the *Cruelty, Injury, and Injustice,*
 by himself supposed to be done to Dr.
 Rundle ; and forget all he had before said
 well of the Dr. and tell us, that " Christia-
 ' nity may suffer by the Dr.'s being promo-
 ' ted to that high Station, as it may give of-
 ' fence to Numbers of good Christians, par-
 ' ticularly those under his Care, who may
 ' be possessed that he is guilty of — having

‘ spoken things unbecoming a Preacher of the Gospel, and which may seem to argue an Irreverence for the holy Scriptures,” p. 16. or that otherwise, “ the Reverend Prelate, who is said to make the greatest opposition to the Dr.’s Promotion, would readily give his Consent to his being advanced to the See of Gloucester.” p. 14.

What an Excess of *Rant* and *Cant* is in all this, and which *makes up great part of his Letter*. In one place he asserts, that nothing can justify what *some* have acted in preventing a *worthy Man* (Dr. Rundle) from being made a Bishop. In another, Christianity may suffer, by his (Dr. Rundle’s) being promoted to that high Station “ Strange ! that this Writer should so far forget himself.” One would almost believe, that my Country-Clergyman, instead of publishing his Thoughts to the discerning World, imagined he was only preaching to a Country-Congregation, a Collection of “ trifling, but invidious Reasons against Dr. Rundle’s Promotion.”

“ Who the Author of this *Case*, &c. is, I shall not take upon me to conjecture ; but this I can’t help observing,” that if the “ Author of the Letter (on whom he remarked) had artfully interwoven the Cause of Liberty in this Affair,” I dare believe, that every impartial Person who reads his Pamphlet, must be sensible, that he has more artfully insinuated, that the Cause of Christianity will suffer by Dr. Rundle’s Promotion ; and with no less smooth Art, endeavoured to persuade Dr. Rundle, to submit to what he calls himself *hard Council*, hard to comply with, even “ to make

it his own request, that the See of Gloucester may be immediately filled up by some other Person."
 And this too, on the Supposition of the Dr.'s *knowing his own Innocence.*"

The Country Clergyman's Words, as to the Dr.'s Innocence are, addressed to the Dr. *viz.*
 "there is not one thing which the Author of the Letter has urged in your Defence, either with respect to your *Character*, or the *Uncharitableness* and *Cruelty* of the Charge brought against you, for what you said in Conversation on so many years ago, in which I do not heartily agree with him" *p. 30.* And in the very next Page, says he, you (the Dr.) "will probably think this hard Council, hard to comply with, when you know your own Innocence; and undoubtedly so it is. But as no good Man will interpret this Concession, as proceeding from the least Consciousness of Guilt; so you will raise to your self a much greater Reputation, than if you had made all opposition to fall before you".

For my own part, I cannot think any will believe, that the Reverend Divine, who gives this Advice to Dr. Rundle, would himself on a like Occasion, put the same in Execution; tho' it might "raise to himself a much greater Reputation; as much greater as *Christian Forgiveness*, excels all *worldly Policy*; as much greater as no *worldly Honors*, or *Advantages* are worthy to be compared or to be put into the Ballance, with the Peace of the Church; but above all, the not giving offence." Was it only, lest such Concession might discover a Consciousness of Guilt?

I am certain however, that the Dr. himself ought not to conform thereto ; because such Concession, “ would be interpreted to proceed ‘ from Consciousness of Guilt.’” It being what his Adversaries in fact already say. For one thus expresses himself ; * “ If the Dr. refuses to ‘ defend himself publicly, it will still appear to ‘ the World, he is the Aggressor, and that all he ‘ has been charged with, is but too true ; and ‘ *more especially so*, if what I am told is fact,--- ‘ that the Dr. desists from, and has dropt his ‘ Pretensions to the Bishoprick, and desires ‘ not to be preferred. All those things make ‘ it appear still worse, and serve rather to aggravate, than mitigate the Imputations wherewith he is charged.”

Now which Advice of his two Adversaries ought the Dr. to be governed by, that which in its Consequence will most tend, to acquit him of his supposed Guilt ? Or that, which will “ serve rather to aggravate, than mitigate the Imputations, wherewith he is charged ?” I dare believe none would be at a loss, especially, one of Dr. Rundle’s good Sense and Judgment.

Before I proceed, to Examine my Author’s two Objections to Dr. Rundle’s Preferment ; I mean the *one single Point*, and the other *only Light in which it ought to be considered* ; I cannot excuse my self, to omit one other Instance of this Author’s Skill in the Art of Persuasion, and Self-contradiction.

* Some seasonable Remarks upon a Pamphlet Entitled, *The Reasons alleged against Dr. Rundle’s Promotion*, &c. p. 5.

Says he, “ I am perswaded, that *many*
 ‘ of the *Bishops* and *Numbers* of *others*, both
 ‘ *Clergy* and *Laity*, have the same sentiment of
 ‘ *Dr. Rundle*, as this Writer ; they acknowledge
 ‘ him to be a sober, temperate, good-natured
 ‘ Man ; a Friend to the King and his Family,
 ‘ a Friend to the Administration, an Enemy to
 ‘ Popery, a Friend to the Protestant Religion, a
 ‘ good Christian, a constant Church man, and
 ‘ a regular Conformist.” Now this Excellent
 Character of any other Person but *Dr. Rundle*,
 given by *many Bishops*, and *Numbers of others*,
 both *Clergy* and *Laity*, would, I believe, infalli-
 bly remove the Censure and Reflection of the
 most detracting Tongue.

And could any Friend of the *Dr's* have
 said more, “ to excite Pity and Compassion
 ‘ in some, and inflame the Passions of others,
 ‘ that a Man of this Character is denied a
 ‘ *Bishoprick* ?” For my own part, I cannot
 think it possible : But it seems, all this is only
plausibly urged : For, says this Author, (“ they,
 ‘ the *Bishops*) might be justified in not
 ‘ approving the *Dr's* Promotion ; they might
 ‘ be concerned to see a Person promoted to that
 ‘ high Station, at which *Numbers* of Persons
 ‘ might take *Offence*, and give the Enemies of
 ‘ Christianity too much Occasion to tri-
 ‘ umph”.

I have heard much of cutting Peoples Throats
 with a Feather. Certainly, if it was ever done,
 this Clergyman has attempted it to *Dr. Rundle*.

But tho' this Clergyman admits that he
 is “ an Advocate for those *Bishops* who op-
 ‘ pose the *Dr's* being promoted to the See
 ‘ of *Glocester*” ; p. 30. yet I cannot see any
 ‘ reason

‘ reason *such* Bishops have, to approve of the Method he has taken for that purpose, or to thank him for it.

For must it not be an Aspersion cast on his favourite Prelate, any Bishop, and every Person, who can take offence, “ that a sober, ‘ temperate, good-natur’d Man ; a Friend to ‘ the King and his Family, a Friend to the ‘ Administration, an Enemy to Popery, a ‘ Friend to the Protestant Religion, a good ‘ Christian, a constant Churchman, and a ‘ regular Conformist,” should be made a Bishop? The Man, whose *Accusation* brought against him, is *unrighteous*, and a piece of great *Cruelty*? It might with great reason have given offence to any Bishop, and a good Person, had the Doctor’s Character been the reverse of all this. But surely, it must be a severe Reflection on every Bishop, and good Christian, that can take offence at the Preferment of one, who has, and deserves the Character which this Author gives of Dr. Rundle. And here it may not be amiss to collect and give the Reader at one View, this Clergyman’s Sentiments of Dr. Rundle’s Case and Character, as are to be found in his Pamphlet.

His Words are, “ Far be it from me to justify those, who were the Informers against the ‘ Dr. I think, nothing can justify the part ‘ they have acted ; not only as it is betraying ‘ private Conversation, the relating an un- ‘ guarded Expression, the being the occasion ‘ of such an unhappy Contention as this, and ‘ the preventing a *very worthy Man* from being ‘ made a Bishop ; who, whatever unguarded

‘ Ex-

‘ Expression might fall from him in his younger Days, and in a free Conversation, might probably be very far from being designed to express any Irreverence for the Scriptures; and for which, I believe, he has now the greatest Reverence and Esteem.” p. 14.

“ That Dr. *Rundle* has every Qualification, which the Author of the Letter bestows on him, I verily believe he has; That it is very cruel and uncharitable to accuse him, for what passed in Conversation fifteen or sixteen Years ago; that unless the Words had been taken down in Writing at that time, it is highly improbable, that any Man can charge his Memory with them; that the Tone of the Voice, the Motion of the Hand, the Gesture of the Body, or many other Circumstances might determine Words in quite another sense, than what they may appear to those who were not present at the Conversation; that the most prudent Clergyman may indiscreetly, in a thoughtless Mood, have said something, which he would very unwillingly; and it would be very cruel and unchristian, to have made the Test of his Abilities, his Morals, or Beliefs.” p. 21, 22.

“ That there is not one thing, which — the Author of the Letter has urged in his Defence, either with respect to his Character, or the Uncharitableness and Cruelty of the Charge brought against *him*, for what *he* said in Conversation so many Years ago, in which I do not heartily agree with him.”

Again,

Again, "I am perswaded, that *many* of the
 ' Bishops, and Numbers of others, both Clergy
 ' and Laity, have the same Sentiments of Dr.
 ' Rundle as this Writer (Dr. Rundle's Friend.)
 ' They acknowledge him to be a sober, tem-
 ' perate, good-natur'd Man; a Friend to the
 ' King and his Family, a Friend to the Ad-
 ' ministration, an Enemy to Popery, a Friend
 ' to the Protestant Religion, a good Christian,
 ' a constant Churchman, and a regular Con-
 ' formist — They readily acknowledge all
 ' this," p. 20. And he also agrees with the
 Letter-writer (Dr. Rundle's Friend) "that
 ' what he has said of the Unrighteousness of
 ' the Accusation brought against the Dr. is
 ' true." p. 17.

This is the Case of Dr. Rundle, and his
 Character, stated and given by his Adversa-
 ries. This is the Man who has been so basely
 aspersed, so vilely calumniated, in order to
 obstruct his Advancement to a Bishoprick.
 The very Person, whom the "Reverend
 ' Prelate, who is said to make the greatest
 ' Opposition to his Preferment" at some times
 ' thinks so deserving, "as that he would rea-
 ' dily give his Consent to his being advanced
 ' to the See of *Glocester*, were it not for the
 ' great Offence it might give to well-meaning
 ' pious People." p. 14, 15. What an Age
 then do we live in, for any to be offended at
 such a good Man's being made a Bishop?

The Cruelty and Injustice done the Dr.
 will better appear, by a few Remarks on the
 recited Passages, and my Answer to the Cler-
 gyman's Objections against the Dr.'s Promoti-
 on; the one, of Christianity's being likely to
 suffer

suffer by the Dr.'s Promotion; the other, of giving offence to pious, well-meaning Christians.

If, according to this Author, "nothing can justify those who informed against the Dr. in betraying private Conversation, and relating an unguarded Expression, that might fall from him in his younger Days, in a free Conversation, and which might probably be far from being designed to express an Irreverence for the Scriptures, for which this Author believes the Dr. to have now the greatest Esteem and Reverence." why then, should the same *worthy Man be prevented from being made a Bishop?* Or his Promotion thereto, "occasion Christianity to suffer, or well-meaning pious Christians to be offended"? Since it's more than probable, that no Man yet ever advanced to that high Station, but what has let fall an unguarded Expression in his younger Days, without ever expecting it to be betrayed; or in his more mature Years, to have it made an Objection to his Preferment.

If Dr. Rundle "has every Qualification, which the Author of the Case, verily believes he has; and that it is very cruel and uncharitable to accuse him, for what passed in Conversation fifteen or sixteen Years ago; That unless the Words had been taken down in writing at that time, 'tis highly improbable, that any Man can charge his Memory with them"; why then, should a Man so *well qualified, suffer under a cruel and uncharitable Accusation*, and meet with Obstruction in his Preferment; since "the most prudent Clergyman may indiscreetly, in a

F

thought-

‘thoughtless Mood, have said something, which
 ‘he would very unwillingly; and it would be
 ‘cruel and unchristian, to have made the Test,
 ‘of his Abilities, his Morals, or Belief”?
 Or how can the Promotion of a Person to a
 Bishoprick, so *well qualified*, give the least room
 to suspect, that “Christianity will suffer there-
 by,” or, that any well-meaning pious Christi-
 an, ought in reason to be *offended* thereat?

—If, “many of the Bishops and Numbers of
 others, both Clergy and Laity, acknow-
 ledge Dr. Rundle, to be a sober, temperate,
 ‘good natured Man; a Friend to the King and
 ‘his Family, a Friend to the Administration, an
 ‘Enemy to Popery, and a Friend to the Pro-
 testant Religion; a good Christian, a constant
 Churchman, and a regular Conformist”, can
 it offend any Bishop or other Person of the
 same Character, here given Dr. Rundle, to
 have one of such singular, uncommon, and
 most excellent Accomplishments, advanced to
 the *high Station* of a Bishop? Or can Christi-
 anity suffer by the Promotion of a Person so
 truly Valuable? It’s impossible for *such* as
 justly deserve the Character given Dr. Rundle
 by this Author, to believe the one or o-
 ther.

But tho’ to every Impartial Person, it must
 already evidently appear, that neither Christi-
 anity could any way suffer by Dr. Rundle’s
 Preferment to a Bishoprick, no more than any
 good Christian ought thereby to be offended;
 yet I will, as promised, consider more par-
 ticularly each of those Points.

The Author whom I am answering, admits Dr. Rundle innocent of every Charge with which his Adversaries accuse him; and pretends to oppose his Preferment, only, as Christianity may suffer, or good Christians be offended. But can an innocent Man's being accused, occasion Christianity to suffer, or give offence to good Christians? I believe, none will say it, lest it might reflect on our blessed Saviour himself, who was accused of many notorious Crimes, tho' his Life was perfectly holy and sinless. How then is it possible to conceive, that the Preferment of an innocent good Man, suffering under an unjust Accusation, can occasion the Enemies of Religion to triumph, Christianity thereby to suffer, or pious good Christians to be offended.

As to Christianity, I should beg leave to ask any serious good Christian, by which method it is most likely to suffer, and for the Enemies thereof to have Occasion to triumph? Either for a Tale-bearer, a base Man, and a Betrayer of private Conversation, to be encouraged to asperse, defame, and egregiously injure a Person, so deserving as Dr. Rundle, is acknowledged to be, even by one who writes against him? Or that the Dr. Innocent of the Crimes with which he is charged, should be preferred, to a Bishoprick? Whereby a public Testimony may be given, of the Baseness of his Accusation, and the Cruelty of his suffering such Injury and Injustice. I am certain the Question, is easily solved. For how can Christianity suffer, by having

Christian, a sober, temperate Man," advanced in the Christian Church ? Especially as such an Advancement, will have no small tendency to wipe off, an *unrighteous Accusation* against him, and discourage others from the like base, and villainous Attempt. To me it seems an Instance of Christianity to discountenance a wicked calumnious Man, and that Christianity will certainly suffer in the Esteem of Deists and Infidels as well as Christians, if an innocent Man, is *marked* for punishment, because he has the misfortune to lye under the Censure of a slanderous Tongue. And was it to be thought otherwise, hard would be the Fate of many real, pious, and good Christians.

Indeed, to advance a Person to a Bishoprick, guilty of any Crimes inconsistent with that holy and sacred Character, would, no doubt, give offence to Numbers of good Christians, and might in some measure do an Injury to Christianity. But the Reverse thereof cannot be also true. I mean, that the preferring a *good Christian, a sober, temperate Man*, one innocent of what he has the misfortune to be accused of, can either hurt Christianity, or offend *good Christians*; because then Contraries would agree, and things must change their nature; as the Preferment of one unjustly slandered and accused, would give the same, and no less Offence to Christianity, and good Christians, than one preferred who was the Reverse of that Character.

The Reader will remember, this Author lays, the Stress of the Argument against the Dr.'s Preferment, on the supposition of his Innocence labouring under ill Fame, on account of the detriment it may do notwithstanding to Christianity, and be a means of offending many good Christians, should he (tho' innocent of such Accusation) be preferred to a Bishoprick.

Thus have I considered this *single Point*, on which the Reasonableness of Dr. Rundle's Preferment ought to be try'd, as this Author thinks, *viz.* That of Christianity's being likely to suffer by his Promotion. And, I hope, the Reader will be convinced, I have fully demonstrated, that the truth is very contrary to what he has asserted.

I now hasten to examine "the only Light in which it ought to be considered; which is, *that* of giving offence to well-meaning People."

Permit me then to enquire of any serious, understanding, good Christian, who is well-affected to our happy Establishment, if he can be offended at the Promotion of a Person to a Bishoprick, who is a "sober, temperate, good-natur'd Man, a Friend to the King and his Family, a Friend to the Administration, an Enemy to Popery, a Friend to the Protestant Religion, a good Christian, a constant Churchman, and a regular Conformist," and and who is declared by this Author to be thought innocent of what slanderous Tongues have accused him of. If none will say it, as I dare believe,

believe, none can ; then the Objection against the Dr.'s Preferment, as to giving offence to good Christians, " the only Light in which it ought to be considered," is fully determined in his Favour.

Nay, this Country-Clergyman does himself much question, whether " the Proof of those things, laid to the charge of Dr. *Rundle*, are so clear and strong, as to convince Men of true Judgment." p. 14. Can then his Promotion offend the Judicious and Discerning, or " Men of true Judgment?" It's most certain, such can never be offended. And should his Promotion give offence to weak and ignorant, but " well-meaning pious Christians ;" must then Weakness, tho' *well meant*, be the *Standard* to judge, and govern things by? Must an innocent Man, one who is acquitted by Men of true Judgment, from a scandalous Aspersion, for ever suffer in his Reputation and Character, lest ignorant, but " well-meaning pious Christians, should be offended, only for that, and no other reason? Sad and deplorable then would be the Case of most Men.

In truth, as no good Christian can be offended at the Promotion of so good a Man to a Bishoprick, as this Author admits Dr. *Rundle* to be ; so it would be an Instance of great Injury and Injustice to Dr. *Rundle*, was his Preferment, which would tend farther to clear and establish his Innocence, as to what he has been basely accused ; to be longer postponed, only to please such People, who have no reason to be offended.

Is it a Christian Principle, to do a certain Evil, that some supposed Good may ensue? To have an innocent Person punished, only to oblige well-meaning People, who, without any Truth or Reason, will be offended at a good Man's being advanced to a Bishoprick? But why should not some care be also taken, not to offend those "many Bishops, and Numbers of others, both Clergy and Laity, who have the same Sentiments of Dr. Rundle, as his Friend who writ in his Favour?" as well as not to offend many well-meaning Christians? To me it seems most reasonable, if both cannot be pleased, that "well-meaning Christians should be offended," rather than "many Bishops, Numbers of the Clergy and Laity, and Men of true Judgment." If Truth and Reason bear sway, it cannot be thought otherwise. And in fact this Point has been often so determined. Permit me to give an Instance or two.

Did not that bright Light of the Reformation, that Glorious Ornament of the Church of England, Arch-Bishop Tillotson, suffer under many imputed Crimes, by defaming, base, and detracting Tongues? Was he not charged with Socinianism, giving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to those who would receive it in no other Posture, than Sitting; nay, of being no Christian for want of Baptism? But did any but Papists and Jacobites believe the Report of either to be true? Or, did those glorious and immortal Princes, King William, and Queen Mary, regard the Suggestion, that it might give offence to well-meaning pious Christians, to prefer him in the Church, when they

they raised him even from a Dean, to the Archiepiscopal See of *Canterbury*? And yet that very Objection, was made and urged by himself, to their Majesties; and (no doubt, by his Enemies also) as Bishop *Burnet* in his Funeral Sermon, informs us. His Words are, “ That which went the deepest in his own Mind, and which he laid out the most earnestly before their Majesties was, that those groundless Prejudices with which his Enemies had loaded him, had been so industriously propagated, while they were neglected by himself, that he, who (as his Humility made him think) could at no time do any great service, was less capable of it now, than ever. But their Majesties persisted in their Intentions, and so he submitted.”

Did not an Eminent Prelate, a very great Man, while a Dean, experience the evil Effects, of envious and malicious Tongues only for his Zeal, and sincere Attachment to the present Royal Family, in opposition to those who were its implacable Enemies? And was not a Story most wickedly invented, and artfully propagated, in order to represent him in the most odious, and invidious Light? And yet that Wise and Judicious Prince, our late most Gracious Sovereign, never hesitated to prefer him to a Bishoprick, and afterwards to an Archiepiscopal See, tho’ it’s certain, many were, but without Reason, offended thereat.

The same Instance may be given in a great Man, when Bishop of *Bangor*; at whose Promotion Numbers of Persons took offence; and

and yet it was esteemed a very trifling Objection, in the Opinion of the late King, as well as his present Most Excellent Majesty, who has given public Testimony, how much he discountenances Notions so absurd and irrational, by advancing lately the same Person yet higher in the Church. And all those, who are true Lovers of Liberty, Vertue, and the Protestant Interest, humbly hope and wish to see Maxims of so popular and dangerous a nature, once more condemned by Regal Authority, in the Person of Dr. Rundle.

The Danger to his Majesty's Prerogative, arising from the Method taken by a certain P——e, in the Opposition given to Dr. Rundle's Preferment, has been already fully proved; and further to corroborate the Truth thereof, this Author affords an ample Testimony.

Says my Author, "It may probably be asked, Is it not more reasonable, that this great Churchman (as this Writer contemptuously and indecently calls a Reverend Prelate) should make a *Concession* on his part; — and that he ought to give his *Consent* to Dr. Rundle's being promoted to the See of Gloucester?" To this it may be answered, That before he can be *justified* in making such *Concession*, he ought well to consider, what Influence those things, which are laid to the Charge of Dr. Rundle have upon the Clergy in general," p. 13. Again, "I am fully convinced, that, were it not for the great *Offence* it might give to many well-meaning pious People, this Reverend Prelate, who is said to make the greatest Opposition to the Dr.'s Promotion, would readily give
 G his

his *Consent* to his being advanced to the See of *Glocester*." p. 14, 15.

Can any who reads this, believe the Supremacy of the Church is in his Majesty? Or would be long so, could the Endeavours of some Men succeed? What! cannot the best of Princes, have so much Power, as to prefer a Person to a small Bishoprick, without obtaining the *Consent* of one of his Bishops? And is it a *Condescension* in such Bishop to *consent* thereto? Alas! Poor King! If Monarchy must thus stoop to Prelacy, it is time for the Prince and People to be alarmed, to watch such Power and *narrowly observe which way it moves, that it may be kept under proper Restraints.*

But tho' this Author seems totally forgetful that it is his Majesty's sole Right to fill up vacant Sees, and hath divested him, as far as he could, from any share of Power therein, not the least notice being taking of what his Majesty, might after all please to do in this Affair yet it must be confessed, he hath in some other parts of his Pamphlet allowed the Laity to take part with the Clergy in making Bishops. His Words are, "But I would not have this matter determined by the Clergy alone; I think it ought likewise to be considered, how the Laity may approve of Dr. Randle's being made a Bishop, (who must many of them come under his Care) as well as the Clergy, and may be offended at his Promotion." p. 13.

This Paragraph is pregnant, of various wicked Insinuations, and which would be inexcusable in any, who hath the least regard for the just and Legal Prerogatives of the Crown, to let it escape, without Observation, or rather a seasonable Animadversion, For

For my own part, I always thought, the King was alone to *determine*, the Affair of Dr. *Rundle's* Promotion, without the *Consent* of his *Bishops* and *Clergy*, or the *Approbation* of the *Laiety*. To represent the Case otherwise, must certainly tend greatly to debase his Majesty's Prerogative. At this rate we may soon expect to hear it asserted, that the King ought to consult with his Convocation and Parliament, as to whom they shall think proper and fit Persons, to be made Bishops. Some are clipping his Majesty's Power in military Affairs; others in Matters Ecclesiastical. Should either, or both such Enemies to our Constitution succeed in their Attempts, the King of *Great Britain* would have little more than the Name and Title of King. And then farewell Monarchy, Liberty, and the best Constitution in the Universe.

Again, says my Author, the Clergy and Laity may be offended at Dr. *Rundle's* Promotion. Permit me to ask, Offended with whom? With Dr. *Rundle* it cannot be; for who can be offended at him, for accepting what his Sovereign is pleased to give him? If then they are offended with any one, it must be with Majesty it self; which to affirm, is no less insolent and audacious, than it tends to Sedition to have it so much as insinuated.

There is only one Paragraph more, which to me seems needful to be considered. Says he, "I verily believe it to be certainly true, that the Proof of those things laid to the Charge of Dr. *Rundle*, should not be so clear and strong as to convince Men of true Judgment; yet it may be of fatal Consequence, that a

‘ Person in that high and sacred Station of a Bishop, should be so much as *suspected* to have been guilty of such things, or even to have them reported of him.” p. 14.

It’s, no doubt, a Misfortune to any, whether Clergyman or Layman, to be suspected of such ill things as he is really innocent of, or even to have them reported of him; but as to any fatal Consequence attending it, supposing the Person’s Innocence, I can no way discover. I believe there is no Man living, but would be glad to tread the Stage of Life, unsuspected of Evil, or the Report of any. But is that in the Power of any, even the best of Christians to be secured from? All must know it to be impossible. Why then should it be judged of fatal Consequence to any, since ’tis what none can prevent? This way of reasoning against Dr. Rundle’s Preferment would not be admitted true, on another Occasion; For would this Author think it right, that because a certain Prelate, is more than suspected of being guilty of many things amiss, it should be of such fatal sequence to him, as to anticipate his being farther preferred: I am perswaded, here he would deny the weight of this Argument; unless some Facts were proved against him, and perhaps not then allow it neither. If so, why should it be thought conclusive against Dr. Rundle?

Upon the whole, I think it a very reasonable Conclusion, “ That every Friend to *Monarchy*, Liberty, and the present Government, ought to be surprized at the Opposition raised against Dr. Rundle, and to wish that he were promoted to a *much better See*, than *Glocester*; because

‘ because many Bishops, and Numbers of o-
 ‘ thers, both Clergy and Laity, acknowledge
 ‘ him to be a sober, temperate, good natured
 ‘ Man; a Friend to the King and his Family,
 ‘ a Friend to the Administration, an Enemy to
 ‘ Popery, a Friend to the Protestant Religion, a
 ‘ good Christian, a constant Churchman, and a
 ‘ regular Conformist.”

The Expectation of the Town was no less rais’d, at the advertis’d Letter in the *Weekly Miscellany*, in answer to a Pamphlet, entitul’d, *The Reasons alleg’d against Dr. R——le’s Promotion to the See of G——r*, --- continued; than, I am apt to think, it will be disappointed in the Performance. And it cannot be unnecessary, to give a few Instances, by way of *Sketch*, what little strength of Reason and Argument is there to be found.

In Sect. 3. he says, ‘ No more is meant, as
 ‘ to what has been done in Dr. R——’s Case,
 ‘ than that one, who is a Candidate for Fa-
 ‘ vor, should first remove all reasonable Ob-
 ‘ jections which art rais’d against his being
 ‘ *duly qualified* for it; particularly, that one
 ‘ who sues to be a Governor in the Church,
 ‘ should wipe off all Suspicions of his being
 ‘ disaffected to it.”

Answer. Is every Objection that has been rais’d against a Man reasonable? Or, need any Man do more, to remove all reasonable Objections rais’d against him, where no Charge has

has been legally made and proved, than what you will find in Sect. the 6th of this Letter, viz. he (Dr. R——'s Friend) 'affirms, that 'Dr. R——le avers, that he never had such 'Notions in his *Head or Heart*, as he is charged with." Indeed, the Letter-writer adds, 'But this doth not yet appear.' Why does not the Doctor's Innocence as much, or more appear, from an Averment of his Innocency, as to what he is charged with, which his Friend affirms; as his Guilt, from Hearsay only, unsupported with any legal Proof or Evidence, does appear, or must be supposed and believed? I am certain which of the two is the most Christian Principle, for a Man to espouse. This also is a full Answer to his 4th Section, and to any Charge, of what nature soever, founded on Hearsay only, without other Proofs.

Under his 7th Section I observe, that 'if 'the two Clergymen, who (as it is said) can 'and will, if occasion requires, bear testimony 'against Dr. R——,' and that *their Zeal and Piety* induced them to inform; how came it so very cold and languid, as to lye dormant fifteen or sixteen Years? The Length of time does not discover much Zeal, or great Piety. And if it was a Duty to bear Testimony on the Occasion, against the Dr.'s being a B——p, was it not equally so against all other Preferments he has had in the Church, since the supposed Words were spoken? Or, were the Words such, as for pious and judicious Christians to think so notorious, as to incapacitate Dr. Rundle from being ever made a Bishop, why do not the two pious and most Christian

Di-

Divines publish the Words supposed to be said by the Dr. in their own Names, that all may judge of the criminal nature of them? This would be a just and reasonable part, and what they would expect, did they suffer under the like Asperision. These Considerations plainly evince the Malice and Wickedness of the Opposition made to this Reverend Divine.

“As to the large Catalogue given of Dr. Rundle’s *Virtues*,” by the Author of the *Reasons*, &c. the Letter-writer attempts not to deny him the Character of his practising those Christian Vertues; but sneaks away from a Point so essential, like a poor Reasoner, and worse Christian, to make an Objection; that he could not “find one single Word about Dr. R—’s Orthodoxy there.” And what then? Why! because of that, his Orthodoxy dares not be vouch’d, but must be questioned. The Bishop of London, in his Four Sermons, p. 91. says, “Let the Members of the Church be known by the ancient Tests of real Piety and Goodness, and a devout Attendance on her public Worship: Let all who answer these Characters, account themselves Members of the same Body, and live in Unity and Godly Love.” Is here one Word of Faith, or of Orthodoxy? And what! Is not the Bishop orthodox, for want of mentioning particularly in this place the Articles of Faith? This Writer, however fond he may be of our Ecclesiastical Constitution, here pays but little Deference to one of its B—ps, and whom he seems to write in favor of.

But

But does not the Author of the *Reasons alleged*, &c. affirm, that Dr. R——le hath subscribed the Articles of Religion, wherein the Christian Faith is particularly mentioned? And must neither the Doctor nor his Friend be orthodox, unless the Christian Faith, or Articles of Faith, are made part of every Sentence in the Letter writ in his Vindication?

Señt. 12. “He (the Author of the *Reasons alleged*) suggests, “as if something had been given up, which was at first objected to ‘Dr. R——’s Promotion. It is false. No-thing has been given up, which was at first ‘objected.’”

Answer. Can this Reply come from any, but the Great Ecclesiastic himself, or by his Privy or Knowledge? For who, but himself, could say, It is false; *nothing has been given up, that was at first objected?* This farther evinces the Truth of what has been before hinted.

Señt. 14. He says, “That it is *Truth*, and ‘no Slander, that there is not an *Infidel*, ‘*Deist*, or *Modern Free-thinker*, in the King-
dom, who is not zealous for his Promotion.”

Answer. If so, is it not *Truth*, and no Slander, that those several *Señts* have more Humanity and moral Vertue, in wishing a Man, who is unjustly accused, may succeed, to defeat the Designs of his Enemies; than the — his Accusers — have of Charity and Christian Goodness, in aspersing Ecclesiastics

clesiastics. To believe the Dr. guilty of Arianism, and denying some part of Revelation, on Hearsay, and a general Charge, is Proof enough. But what his Friend affirms, in favour of his Innocence, and that he had no such Notions *in his Head or Heart*, must be questioned and disbelieved, as what *doth not yet appear*, condemning him on Hearsay; without the least Evidence or Proof. And does not such an Instance afford us reason to think, that in the Day of Judgment, it will be more tolerable, for such human and moral unchristian Lay-men, than for any inhuman and unchristian Priests?

It would be tedious to observe more of the great Charity and clear Reasoning of this Writer. Whoever reads his Letter, will see, that all Assertions to make the Dr. guilty, are decreed sufficient upon bare Hearsay. But whatever tends to clear up his Guilt, is either declared to be *false in Fact*, or that it *does not appear true*. Is not this a very fair, honest, Christian way of writing? But to what a pitch of Ecclesiastic Madness, want of Charity and true Religion, will Bigotry and the ignorant Zeal of some Men transport them?

I do know, and can prove, that a certain B——p, had a C——n, who was accused, and by Hearsay condemned, of very immoral Practices; whether guilty thereof, I pretend not to say. But the same B——p knew of his being thus calumniated, if it was a Slander, and has since given him a very considerable Living in Town, and a smaller one in the Country. I would then desire to know the reason; why a B——p may give two Livings to one Man,
N
who

who suffered under ill Fame for immoral Practices ? More than for a Lord High C——r to recommend another to a B--p---k, who is reported to have said about sixteen Years ago, that some Texts of Scripture were to be taken in a different sense from the common Acceptation. That Predestination, Original Sin, and Justification by Faith, are by Moderns believ'd in a Sense different from former times, is well known : Also the Article of our Creed, as to Christ's Descent into Hell (if hereby is meant the Place of the Damned) is not now taken in the Literal Sense. And is it Heresy, for any one to think different in these Points from the Notions that former times had imbibed ? Or any instance of Infidelity, or disbelieving the divine Authority of the Scriptures ? Is it a Concern of more heinous nature, for a Man to be suspected guilty of Errors in matters of Speculation, wherein many good Men may, and do differ ; than of immoral Practices, wherein all agree ? And is a Slander for Words ill said to be spoken, worse than immoral Actions said to be acted ? So that supposing each Divine aspersed, why must ill Fame be more criminal and fatal to the last, than it was to the first ? Which is all the Use I intend, or would be thought to make of the stated Case. The Reverend Dr. meant by me, I have often heard preach, with much Pleasure and Satisfaction ; and do heartily and sincerely hope, that the Crimes imputed to him, are only the effects of a detracting, base and slanderous Tongue, and which it's every Man's duty to bridle in himself, and prevent in others, to the utmost of his power.

